

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, receipt of the office action dated January 12, 2007 and completion of the personal interview of April 25, 2007. The Examiner's observations and suggestions are much appreciated and are summarized herein.

Claims 39-40, 42-45, 47, 48, 50-53, 55, 56, 58-62, 64, 65, 67-71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0048473 to Rosen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,392 to Henry et al. further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,690 to Cantwell. Claims 41, 49, 57, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen in view of Henry in view of Cantwell further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,247,081 to Murata. Claims 46, 54, 63, and 72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen in view of Henry in view of Cantwell further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,256,668 to Slivka et al. For the amendments and arguments set forth below, all claims are patentable over the art of record.

By way of review, the subject application is directed to a system and method for network-based uploading of drivers for document processing devices. In one embodiment, a plurality of alternative software drivers or components of device software, including at least one executable software installation utility, is received into a memory integrated with a document processing controller, wherein the software drivers or components are for use with associated workstations or client machines in communication with a document processing device associated with the controller. A graphical user interface is generated on the associated workstations, wherein the user interface includes a list of each of the plurality of available software drivers stored in the memory. Operating system data representative of an operating system type is received. A user selectively directs loading of at least one of the plurality of software drivers to a storage area on an associated workstation via the graphical user interface in accordance with received operating system data and identifies at least one executable software installation utility associated with the at least one software driver. An executable installation utility that corresponds to the one or more selected drivers is sent to the workstation along with the driver. Operation of the executable software installation utility is then commenced on the associated workstation so as to install the at least one of the plurality of software drivers thereon.

In contrast, Rosen is directed to a system wherein a printing device communicates a device driver to a computer connected thereto. There is no exchange of information between the printer and

the computer that allows for communication of one or more drivers that are compatible with the computers particular operating system. Unlike Rosen, the subject application teaches a system that is compatible for communication of drivers in various operating system environments, such as Windows or Linux. One or more compatible drivers are bundled with an executable installation utility which is communicated to a computer or workstation, and then a compatible driver is installed on the workstation upon execution of that installation utility.

In accordance with the discussions in the personal interview, the aspects noted above have been included in each claim by virtue of amendment into each independent claim. More particularly, each claim now includes limitations wherein a driver bundle is communicated in accordance with data representative of an operating system on the target computer. This bundle is associated with an installation utility which is communicated with the driver bundle, and then executed to complete the driver installation process.

The deficiencies of Rosen are not remedied by the additional art of record. Henry is cited as teaching a system for installation of drivers using a graphical user interface for downloading driver, but fails to teach the novel structure noted above. Cantwell is cited as teaching drivers selected from a listing, but similarly fails to teach the novel structure noted above. Murata, which is cited for installing a previously installed driver and Slivka, which is cited for receiving user input to commence a transfer are also deficient in their teachings.

If there are any fees necessitated by the foregoing communication, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0902, referencing our Docket No. 66329/14561.

Date: May 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Susan L. Mizer
Registration No. 38,245
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
1150 Huntington Bldg.
925 Euclid Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1414
Customer No.: 23380
Tel.: (216) 696-3466
Fax: (216) 592-5009